



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ur may have had is irrelevant for the present. Nippur, therefore, goes back to Nin-bur, or Nin-pur, the original name of the god. The name thus was given to the place at a time when the people were still in the animistic stage of religion. Nin-Uraš thus was the oldest and most renowned spirit of the place, and in time gave his name to it. This is in perfect harmony with Babylonian mythology. Nin-Uraš of Nippur in the astral mythology of Babylonia figures as the planet Saturn. Although the particular myth in which Nin-Uraš figures as Saturn has not yet been recovered from the ground of Babylonia, there is absolutely no doubt that, in view of the widespread myth of the elder god slain by the younger, Nin-Uraš the elder god was slain by the younger god Enlil in the same fashion as was Saturn by Jupiter etc.

H. F. LUTZ

University of California

Shāhbāzgarhī uthānam; Śaurasēnī locative in ē

May I supplement Dr. Truman Michelson's remarks on Shāhbāzgarhī *uthānam* (*JAOS* 41. 460) by referring to an article on *The Linguistic Relationship of the Shāhbāzgarhī Inscription* on pp. 725 ff. of the *JRAS* for 1904? I there pointed out that this inscription was incised in the neighbourhood of what is now the country in which the Modern Piśāca (or, as I now call them, Dardic) languages are spoken at the present day, and that numerous instances of its phonetic peculiarities are paralleled by forms in these tongues. This country was also the home of the Kaikēyā Paiśācīkī of Mārkaṇḍēya, with which the Dardic languages closely agree¹.

Even the Paiśācī Prakrit of Hēmacandra (spoken apparently in Central India) shows a weak sense of the difference between dental and cerebral *t* (*Hc.* 4. 311), and this is much more prominent in the Dardic languages. In Šiṇā, the language of Gilgit, the pronunciation of dentals and cerebrals fluctuates, and my latest authority, a skilled phonetician, who is stationed in the country, informs me that the usual pronunciation of

¹ See *ZDMG* 66. 77ff. for resemblances between them and Hēmacandra's Paiśācī.

both approaches that of the English alveolars. Even in so Sanskrit-ridden a language as literary Kāshmirī, there are many instances of the interchange of cerebrals and dentals. As an extreme example, — in poetry *Yindrazīth* (= *Indrajit*) rhymes with *dīthū* (= *dr̥ṣṭā*).

Coming now to Dr. Michelson's *uthānam*, it may be noted that relations of this word are common in Dardic, and that they nearly all agree with Mārkaṇḍēya's Śaurasēnī in preserving the dental *th*. Maiyā has √*uth*-, Kāshmirī has √*wōth*-, and Baṣḡalī Kāfir has √*ut*- or √*ušt*-. So, in the related Sindhi we have √*uth*-, and in Lahndā the word *uthā*, up, above. Horn (*Grundriss der neupersischen Etymologie*, § 84) refers the Balōci √*vušt*- to *ava* + √*stā*-, but it is equally possible that it as well as the above forms come from *ut* + √*sthā*-, like the Śaurasēnī *utthidō*.

I would therefore suggest that the Shāhbāzgarhī *uthānam* is to be referred to the ancestor of Dardic, rather than to Śaurasēnī influence.

On page 462 of the same number of the *JAOS* Dr. Michelson refers to Mārkaṇḍēya's rule that in Śaurasēnī, the locative singular of *a*-bases ends only in *ē*, while in the case of *i*- and *u*-bases it ends in *mmi*. For the latter he offers three possible explanations (himself preferring the first), viz. (1) that Māhārāṣṭrī has influenced Śaurasēnī, (2) that Mārkaṇḍēya has made a mistake, and (3) that the manuscripts of his grammar need correction.

Regarding the third suggested explanation, I may state that I have five MSS. of the grammar, and that on this point they all agree with the printed text. Regarding the second suggestion, as Mārkaṇḍēya is entirely borne out by Rāma-śarman (Tarkavāgiśa) in the chapter referring to Śaurasēnī in the *Prākṛta-kalpataru*, (II, x, 14, *ēd ēva nēh syād, id-ud-antayōr mmiḥ*), it appears that, at least according to the eastern school of Prakrit grammarians, he has made no mistake, and that Dr. Michelson's preference for his first explanation is amply justified.

GEORGE A. GRIERSON

Camberley, England